UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)		81	WEL
v.)))	No. 3:10-cr-00046 CHIEF JUDGE HAYNES	s ps 6	nohou 20075D with
STEVEN DWAYNE PITTMAN	, 	Lo	ral Ru	tem
MOTION TO RECONSIDER AND RESPONSE TO THE DEFENDANT'S a mahan MOTION TO REOPEN THE SUPPRESSION HEARING				
The United States of America he	ereby moves thi	s Honorable Court to reconsider		and any
granting the defendant leave to reopen	the suppression	hearing. Docket Entry No. 12	4. Due to	aggridued
the celerity with which this Court issued	d the order, the	United States was not able to r	espond to	Upanty
the defendant's motion to reopen the sup	pression hearin	g found at Docket Entry No. 12	3. k	rione
The defendant asks for this C	Court to reoper	n the suppression hearing and	tries to	neouseda
demonstrate good cause by blaming h	nis attorney. Th	nere are extremely narrow gro	unds that	me usher
warrant reopening a suppression hearing	ng. He has wa	ited years to first mention this	s, despite	HORECAUTED USGROWING
complaining about other matters. Furth	ermore, this ju	stification is not believable be	cause the	but the
defendant did not merely fail to all	ege that his s	signature was forged—he affi		prian Inder
represented he had signed the form. He o	, ,			AFFIRMEY
defendant has produced no evidence d			deny the	1.1121
defendant's motion to reopen it because	he has not sho	own good cause or, at the very	least, this	mool)
defendant's motion to reopen it because he has not shown good cause or, at the very least, this when the court should order an evidentiary hearing requiring the defendant to demonstrate that good cause fruct does in fact exist. Some of the entire when his the court when he court had been also for the court of the c				
does in fact exist.		some gta relies	u euch circum hau	ly pre
	1	false	Lile	JSF 1